MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
January 8, 2003
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman   William McEntee, Member
Thomas Wieczorek, Vice Chairman   Rick Deuell, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member   Susan Mortel, Member
John Kolessar, Member   John Elsinga, Member
Steve Warren, Member   Aaron Hopper, Member

Staff Present

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Zoe Lorca, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Call to Order

Chairman Palombo called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. in the Bureau of Aeronautics Auditorium, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of December 4, 2002, Council Minutes

John Kolessar moved for approval of the minutes, supported by Rick Deuell. Rick Lilly noted that the minutes needed to be amended on page 3 in the first paragraph, line 5, following the end of the first sentence, insert: "Ms. Mortel raised the issue that the Council needs to be aware of any legal requirements relative to contracts, as they pertain to taking bids or sole source contracts." The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

Correspondence/Announcements

Rick Lilly explained the absence of Charles Krupka. He also mentioned that the security ID badges are not yet ready. Mr. Lilly passed out the 2003 Travel Reference card. Mr. Lilly announced that the Legislature had approved the Council's supplemental budget.

Financial Report

The financial report was delayed until the February meeting.

Update on RoadSoft Contract

Rick Lilly reported to the Council on a proposed budget for adding an additional programmer to the staff developing the RoadSoft software in order to have a multi-county capability. Terry McNinch, director of the group developing RoadSoft, had submitted a proposed budget of $95,000 to complete the effort. After further examination, and in consultation with Ron Young, chair of the RoadSoft Users Group, staff decided not to pursue this effort at this time. Rather, each regional planning agency will be provided with each county within their area and that the multi-county element will be done over the next 18 months.

Pilot Project Presentations

Mr. Lilly gave a presentation on the initial pilot project developed in cooperation by the County Road Association and the Michigan Department of Transportation. Mr. Lilly passed out a series of maps and slides that were in the presentation. Steve Warren stated that Kent County did a comparison of the PASER methodology with the MicroPaver currently used in Kent County. He said that it had been their experience in Kent County that the PASER tended to rate most roads somewhere in the middle, neither really good or really bad. He said he felt that this was due to the fact that the PASER system relied on the subjective opinion of the person in the vehicle. MicroPaver, on the other hand, tended to show a larger number of poorly rated roads because it was based more on objective data such as counting cracks in the asphalt. MicroPaver also rated good roads better than PASER. Mr. Warren also pointed out that the Council should look closely at developing an equivalency chart to compare PASER ratings with those of MicroPaver.

Dave Gillis, director, Central Upper Peninsula Planning & Area Development Council (CUPPAD) gave a presentation regarding the pilot project developed to test how a regional planning agency might coordinate the data collection effort. He passed out copies of the presentation to the Council members. Mr. Gillis presented the following observations gathered by the pilot project team:

- Nearly 50 percent of the total miles driven were "deadhead" miles. This was partly due to the fact that they were rating only the non-trunkline federal-aid miles,

- Difficult to rate gravel roads because they can change drastically depending on the weather,

- Local participation is very important, and

- Seal coat roads should have their ratings be more independent of drainage issues.

The team concluded that the pilot project was successful and a good opportunity to build stronger relationships with and among the local officials. Mr. Warren asked if any presentations had been given to elected officials. Mr. Gillis indicated that they had not.

Mr. Warren asked if it would be more efficient to do the state trunkline and federal-aid eligible roads together. Mr. Gillis said that the experience of the pilot project was such that it would be more efficient to do those roads together.

Mr. Palombo asked if the data collected would be used in making decisions regarding road repairs and maintenance by the local agencies involved. Mr. Gillis said that it was being used by Menominee County. They had only spoken with two counties since the completion of the project but he felt that all would find value in the data.

Mr. Elsinga was concerned about the observations regarding drainage. Mr. Kolessar observed that the Council should combine the pilot presentations and the general asset management presentation into an overall outreach presentation to be used with local agencies.

Ms. Mortel asked if the data collection is repeatable and if the costs would remain the same or go down. Mr. Gillis felt that the costs would not be appreciably less, although by driving the state trunklines at the same time. He was also very comfortable that the process is repeatable.

Mr. Warren asked if we had, in the initial pilot, multiple crews rating the same roads to test whether we were getting similar ratings. Mr. Lilly responded that he did not believe we did that deliberately. Lou Lambert indicated that we had done that in Genesee and the results were very similar. Mr. Palombo indicated that if we were to go ahead with the rating of Macomb County's roads in the spring that it might be beneficial to have them do this and to do other types of testing of issues that came up in the first two pilots or had been missed previously.

Several members raised questions regarding the type of data that was collected in addition to the surface rating.

Mr. McEntee pointed out that the PASER data gives you a good "snapshot" of what exists at the time of the rating but in order to do any long-range planning you need more than what PASER gives you. Mr. Warren questioned whether this now means that the "pilot" is concluded. Mr. Lilly responded that with the exception of doing Macomb's roads that this phase of testing is concluded as determined by the Data Management Committee. Mr. Warren felt that the Council should issue a final report. Mr. Lilly indicated he would provide members with the current analysis of the pilot projects so that the Council could add its own

conclusions.

Mr. Elsinga, again raised the issue of drainage. Mr. Lilly pointed out that PASER has a separate manual for drainage. He also indicated that drainage is a very big issue that the Council will need to deal with as they look at what data should be collected. Mr. McEntee pointed out the new requirements for NPDES permits. Mr. McEntee noted that it might be beneficial to work with other groups to get this information so it could be displayed on a map. Mr. Lilly pointed out that it is certainly possible to collect different types of data at different times of the year. Ms. Mortel replied to Mr. McEntee's points by indicating that we should be fine so long as we ensure that the data being collected can be shown on the Framework. Mr. McEntee indicated that it was important to rate the condition of the outfalls as well as their location.

Draft Work Program

Mr. Lilly went through the comments that had been received regarding the draft work program and indicated the changes that had been made.

The review from the regional planning agencies and MPOs indicated a concern regarding the amount of money for collecting data did not include indirect costs. Mr. Lilly pointed out that this was a concern but it was not an issue for the work program per se but rather it would be addressed during any contractual discussions.

There was a concern raised in the review by the county road association members regarding the level of detail. They felt that the document was too detailed. Mr. Lilly indicated that the level of detail was dictated by the wording in Act 499 relative to the work program and the outline that had been approved by the Administrative Committee prior to the writing of the draft. The other major concern that Mr. Lilly noted from their review was that there was no work item that allowed for the development and testing of an asset management process. Mr. Lilly indicated that while the work program did not contain work items that tested the process per se it did contain work items that tested the individual components of such a process. Mr. McEntee indicated they would like to see a flow diagram that indicates what is to be expected from local road agencies and when.

There was considerable discussion regarding whether or not language should be added to the work program regarding the implementation approach of asset management. Council members expressed concern that a "top down" approach would be taken and local agencies would not have a voice in how the process will be carried out. Further, Mr. Warren felt that the Council needed to discuss what is meant by "strategy." Also, it was expressed that many local road agencies are looking to the Council to identify a process that they can use – a "baseline" that will allow them to implement asset management at the local level. Mr. Wieczorek noted

that there is a wide disparity of expertise and abilities at the local level. Consequently, it is necessary to keep things as simple as possible if it is going to be usable.

Mr. Kolessar raised the issue of whether the work program could be amended in the future if the Council saw the need to do something different. Mr. Lilly noted that there was nothing in the law that seemed to prohibit this. Ms. Mortel indicated she had no problems revisiting the work program in the future. She then offered language dealing with Mr. Warren's concerns. Mr. Hopper noted that it was his idea that the Council was to set a benchmark and one that is workable. Mr. Lilly noted that the key principle behind the legislation is that there is to be one method of assessing road and bridge condition that the Legislature can see so that they have some idea of the overall condition of the system. And the key issue before the Council is to decide on what method will be used. Mr. McEntee noted that the methodology needs to be consistent over time. It was decided that Ms. Mortel would work with Mr. Warren to come up with language addressing his concerns.

Mr. Warren suggested that the Council coordinates the public outreach activities of its committees. Mr. Palombo suggested that the Education & Outreach Committee needs to set up some guidelines and that in future agendas that there be reports from anyone who has participated in any public outreach activity regarding the efforts of the Council.

Mr. Kolessar moved that the draft work program be approved with the following changes:

1. References to contracts and the LTAP would be cleaned up to ensure that an open process would be followed,

2. The final section include only a month by month breakdown of tasks, and

3. Changes in wording regarding "strategy" and "strategic" being drafted by Ms. Mortel and Mr. Warren be included. Mr. Wieczorek supported. Approved unanimously.

Public Comment

Ron Young, Alcona County indicated that he supports the efforts of the Council and what it is attempting to do but he cautioned the Council that they not make the process so complicated and cumbersome that smaller agencies cannot use it or benefit from it.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45.

_____
Executive Secretary